

## LEGAL REVIEW NOTE

**Bill No.:** SB 333

**LC#:** LC0230, To Legal Review Copy, as of  
February 22, 2017

**Short Title:** Generally revise medical marijuana  
laws

**Attorney Reviewer:** Todd Everts

**Date:** March 6, 2017

### CONFORMITY WITH STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS

*As required pursuant to section 5-11-112(1)(c), MCA, it is the Legislative Services Division's statutory responsibility to conduct "legal review of draft bills". The comments noted below regarding conformity with state and federal constitutions are provided to assist the Legislature in making its own determination as to the constitutionality of the bill. The comments are based on an analysis of jurisdictionally relevant state and federal constitutional law as applied to the bill. The comments are not written for the purpose of influencing whether the bill should become law but are written to provide information relevant to the Legislature's consideration of this bill. The comments are not a formal legal opinion and are not a substitute for the judgment of the judiciary, which has the authority to determine the constitutionality of a law in the context of a specific case.*

*This review is intended to inform the bill draft requestor of potential constitutional conformity issues that may be raised by the bill as drafted. This review **IS NOT** dispositive of the issue of constitutional conformity and the general rule as repeatedly stated by the Montana Supreme Court is that an enactment of the Legislature is presumed to be constitutional unless it is proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the enactment is unconstitutional. See Alexander v. Bozeman Motors, Inc., 356 Mont. 439, 234 P.3d 880 (2010); Eklund v. Wheatland County, 351 Mont. 370, 212 P.3d 297 (2009); St. v. Pyette, 337 Mont. 265, 159 P.3d 232 (2007); and Elliott v. Dept. of Revenue, 334 Mont. 195, 146 P.3d 741 (2006).*

#### Legal Reviewer Comments:

The 2011 Legislature enacted the "Montana Marijuana Act" (section 50-46-301, MCA, *et seq.*). The Montana Marijuana Act created a framework enabling people with a qualifying medical condition to obtain and possess marijuana for medicinal purposes without threat of prosecution under Montana state law. On November 8, 2016, Montana voters passed Initiative No. 182, renaming the "Montana Marijuana Act" to the "Montana Medical Marijuana Act" and generally revising the medical marijuana laws.

The Montana Medical Marijuana Act may raise potential federal constitutional issues related to the Supremacy Clause under the United States Constitution, Article VI, clause 2, which provides that federal law is the "supreme law of the land". The United States Supreme Court has ruled that the federal Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. 801, *et seq.*, prohibits the manufacture, distribution, dispensation, and possession of marijuana even when state law authorizes its use to treat medical conditions. *Gonzales v. Raich*, 545 U.S. 1, 29, 125 S.Ct. 2195 (2005). Specifically, the Court in *Raich* held that under the Supremacy Clause, the federal statute superseded California's Compassionate Use Act authorizing the limited possession and cultivation of marijuana for medicinal purposes (at 33-17, *Raich*). Similar to California's medical marijuana laws, the Montana Medical Marijuana Act's authorization of use and possession of marijuana for medicinal purposes may conflict with federal law.

LC0230, as drafted, generally revises the Montana Medical Marijuana Act by requiring seed-to-sale tracking and licensing of dispensaries; establishing a tax on medical marijuana sales; establishing requirements for testing laboratories; revising allowable amounts of medical marijuana; requiring testing of samples collected during inspections; eliminating the requirement for a parent to serve as a minor's provider; establishing a tax on medical marijuana providers; and establishing a fee for dispensaries. The Montana Medical Marijuana Act as well as the amendments to the Act<sup>1</sup> contained in LC0230 may potentially conflict with federal law and, by extension, may raise potential constitutional conformity issues pursuant to the United States Supreme Court holding in *Raich*.

**Requester Comments:**

---

<sup>1</sup> LC0230 amendments establishing a tax on sales and on providers would likely not conflict with federal law.